UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,731	11/29/2001	Alangudi Sankaranarayanan	Q66697	3514

7590 03/25/2003

SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20037-3202

EXAMINER
ROBINSON, BINTA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1625	11

DATE MAILED: 03/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/995,731	Applicant(s) SANKARANARAYANAN, ALANGUDI	
	Examiner Binta M. Robinson	Art Unit 1625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-90* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *See Continuation Sheet* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,7,8,10,11,16-26,31,36,41,46-50,53,54,57,59,60,65,66,71,72 and 77-90* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Continuation of Disposition of Claims: Claims withdrawn from consideration are Claims withdrawn from consideration are 3,6,9,12-15,27-30,32-35,37-40,42-45,51,52,55,58,61-64,67-70 and 73-76..

Detailed Action

Group I of the restriction requirement is revised below to encompass the elected species 5:

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16-25, 26, 31, 36, 41, 46, 47-50, 53, 54, 57, 59, 60, 65, 66, 71, 72, 77-90, drawn to the composition of formula I in claim 1 where R1 is N(R7)N(R7) R9, R9 is H, alkyl, SO2R10, and R10 is H and Al, R7 is everything claimed except heterocyclic moieties, R3 is thienyl, X is everything claimed except moieties forming heterocyclic rings, R2 is everything claimed except heterocyclic rings, R10, Y, R11, R12 are as claimed classified in class 546, subclass 279.1.

The 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 72 is withdrawn in light of applicant's amendment at paper no. 9.

Modified Rejection

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16-25, 26, 31, 41, 46, 47-50, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 60, 65, 71, 72, and 77-90 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, does not provide enablement for R2, ~~R7 R9~~, and ~~R10~~ equaling all heterocyclic groups. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims as recited are broader than the scope of enablement. The specification lacks direction or guidance for placing all of the alleged products in the possession of the public without inviting more than routine experimentation. The applicant is referred to ***In re Wands***, 858 f.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in ***Ex parte*** foreman 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. And Inter 1986).

The specification, does not reasonably provide enablement for the method of treating all diseases claimed in claim 82, as well as all diseases caused by accumulation of free radicals as claimed in claim 71. It is also not established in the art to prevent diseases claimed claims 16 and 24. Most drugs do not prevent but treat disease. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The claims as recited are broader than the scope of enablement.

The applicant is referred to ***In re Wands***, 858 f.2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) which includes the incorporation of the 8 factors recited in ***Ex parte*** Foreman 230 USPQ 546 (Bd. Of App. And Inter 1986).

The specification does not enable inhibiting AGE. Inhibiting AGE is a mechanism and is not correlated with a specific disease.

There are many factors to be considered when determining whether there is sufficient evidence to support a determination that a disclosure does not satisfy

the enablement requirement and whether any necessary experimentation is "undue". These factors include 1)the breadth of the claims, 2) the nature of the invention, 3) the state of the prior art, 4) the level of one of ordinary skill, 5) the level of predictability in the art 6) the amount of direction provided by the inventor 7) the existence of working examples, and 8) the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure. In re Wands, 858 F. 2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).
In terms of factor 3 and 5, the state of the art and the level of predictability in the art cannot be predicted with any certainty beyond what specific test compounds /compositions and/or additional therapeutic agents should be used and are likely to provide productive results beyond those therapeutic compounds/compositions and/or additional therapeutic agents taught in the specification.

In terms of factors 4 and 6, the inventor provides no guidance beyond the therapeutic compound/compositions and/or therapeutic agents as taught in the specification as previously mentioned. As a result one of ordinary skill in the art could not predict what other types of therapeutic compounds/compositions and/or additional therapeutic agents, other than those taught in the specification; and with regards to the 7th and 8th wands factor, while the existence of working examples are limited to the aforementioned compounds/compositions as taught in the specification, an indeterminate quantity of experimentation would be necessary to determine all potential therapeutic compounds/compositions' effects the diseases claimed.

In terms of the 8th Wands factors, undue experimentation would be

required to make or use the invention based on the content of the disclosure due to the breadth of the claims, the level of predictability in the art of the invention, and the poor amount of direction provided by the inventor. Taking the above factors into consideration, it is not seen where the instant claim is enabled by the instant application.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. In claim 1, and all other occurrences throughout the claims, the phrase "and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier" is missing from the end of the claim and should be inserted before the period, since this is a composition claim.

The elected species appears to be allowable. However, the elected species does not read on any of the claims including claim 51.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binta M. Robinson whose telephone number is (703) 306-5437. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Alan Rotman can be reached on (703)308-4698. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7922 for regular communications and (703)308-7922 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0193.

Binta Robinson
March 24, 2003

Alan L Rotman

ALAN L. ROTMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600